3.4 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Analysis and Mitigation

Impact Discussion

(a) As is discussed in Sections 3.3.4, Biological Resources, and 3.3.5, Cultural Resources, potentially significant impacts on biological and cultural resources could occur during the deconstruction of the MOT and shore side vault removal activities of the proposed Project. However, implementation of **APM-7, APM-11,** and Mitigation Measures **MM BIO-1a through -1d, MM BIO-4a through -5d, MM BIO-6, MM CUL-1a, and -1b, and HAZ-1a** would reduce impacts on biological and cultural resources, respectively, to less than significant. (Class II)

(b) The proposed Project is the deconstruction of an existing MOT, abandonment of its associated pipelines in San Pablo Bay, and removal of an onshore vault. As documented in Section 3.3, the proposed Project would have No Impact in the areas of Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, and Mineral Resources; accordingly, there is no possibility that the proposed Project could have a cumulatively considerable impact for those resource areas. The proposed Project would have less than significant (Class III) impacts in Geology and Soils, Land Use and Planning, and Recreation, and would have less than significant with mitigation (Class II) impacts in Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. As documented in Section 3.3, the nature of the potential impacts in these resource areas would be very localized and of short duration. Consequently, for these impacts to act cumulatively on any past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects (hereafter called "cumulative projects"), the cumulative projects would have to have individual impacts in the same resource areas at the same time and in the same localized area as the proposed Project.[1] Available planning records for the city of Hercules and Contra Costa County were researched to identify any cumulative projects located within a one-half mile radius of the onshore component (vault removal) of the proposed Project (one-half mile is the furthest extent that the proposed Project would have an incremental unmitigated noise impact; Project-related impacts in the other resource areas would be unlikely to be distinguishable at any greater distance). Because there are no known cumulative projects within a one-half mile radius of the Project area, it is unlikely that the proposed Project as mitigated would have any cumulatively considerable effects. (Class II)

[1] Specifically regarding Air Quality, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines state that for any project that does not individually have significant air quality impacts, the determination of a significant cumulative impact should be based on an evaluation of the consistency of the project with the local general plan and of the general plan with the regional air quality plan. As demonstrated in Section 3.3.3, the proposed Project would be consistent with the adopted clean air plan and the Ozone Strategy and would not result in an operational air quality impact. In addition, the proposed Project would be consistent with the air quality policies in Contra Costa County and the city of Hercules General Plans. As such, the proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for Air Quality.

(c) As discussed in Section 3.3 above, the deconstruction of the MOT and onshore vault as well as material recycling activities at the contractors shore base for the proposed Project could result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly. Some of these potential impacts would occur through air emissions released by construction equipment and activities. Implementation of **APM-3 and MM AIR-1** would reduce potential construction-related air quality impacts to less than significant. Potential impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and/or the accidental spilling or discharge of debris from the deconstruction process could endanger workers and/or residents adjacent to the Project area. These potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant through the implementation of **MM HAZ-1a through HAZ-4b**. Although it would be less likely, the potential discharge of hazardous materials into the bay waters could contaminate fisheries, which in turn if the contaminated fish were eaten could pose a substantial adverse impact on humans. However, implementation of **MM BIO-1a through -1d, MM BIO-4a through -5d,** and **MM BIO-6** would reduce impacts on these biological resources to less than significant. Deconstruction activities at the onshore vault and the contractor's onshore base could cause temporary noise impacts to nearby residents; however, implementation of **MM NOI-1a and NOI-1b** would reduce potential deconstruction-related noise impacts to less than significant levels. (Class II)